

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	CATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/973,205	10/09/2001	Seppo T. Vahasalo	PKR 2 0668	5802		
7:	590 06/03/2003					
Thomas E. Kocovsky, Jr. FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & McKEE, LLP Seventh Floor 1100 Superior Avenue Cleveland, OH 44114-2518			EXAMI	EXAMINER		
			SHAW, SHAWNA JEANNINE			
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			3737			
			DATE MAILED: 06/03/2003	DATE MAILED: 06/03/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Application	No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/973,205		VAHASALO ET AL.			
		Examiner	<u> </u>	Art Unit			
		Shawna J. S	Shaw	3737			
Period fo	- The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	pears on the c	over sheet with the	correspondence add	iress		
THE N - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failus - Any n	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Issions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.15 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing of patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, y within the statutor will apply and will e	, however, may a reply be to ry minimum of thirty (30) do expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro ation to become ABANDON	timely filed ays will be considered timely m the mailing date of this con IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	mmunication.		
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 (October 2001	and 08 April 2003				
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ Th	nis action is no	on-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims							
	Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application	1 .					
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra		sideration.				
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
<u> </u>	Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.						
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election req	juirement.				
Application Papers							
9) 🗌 .	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>12 February 2002</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.							
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been	received.				
	2. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been	received in Applica	ation No			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
			-		application).		
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.							
15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.							
Attachmen	t(s)						
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u>	4 5 <u>2, 4</u> . 6	· =	ary (PTO-413) Paper No(al Patent Application (PTC			
I.S. Patent and T	rademark Office						

Application/Control Number: 09/973,205

Art Unit: 3737

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1, 2 and 9 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 1 line 15, it appears that "systems" should be –system--. In claim 2 line 4, it appears that "lest" should be –least--. In claim 9 line 1, it appears that "magnetic resonance" should be –magnetic resonance imaging--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claims 1 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kormos et al. of record.

Kormos et al. teach an infrared-based wireless remote control device for use in an MRI system. See col. 2 line 52 – col. 3 line 38.

Application/Control Number: 09/973,205

Art Unit: 3737

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 2-14 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kormos et al. of record.

Regarding claims 2-14 and 16-21, Kormos et al. differ from the claimed invention in that infrared signals and a separate display are used. However, Kormos et al. teaches that RF signals above 13.1 MHz may be successfully employed instead of IR (col. 8 lines 44-51) and that alternate control/display means may be used (col. 7 lines 16-51). It would have therefore been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize RF communication signals instead of IR as taught by Kormos et al. to provide an alternative means of communication as is

Application/Control Number: 09/973,205

Art Unit: 3737

recognized in the art as well as a form of communication that is omni-directional and therefore less susceptible to physical obstructions. Moreover, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a remote control device having an integrated display or graphical user interface as is well known in the art while allowing the operator to execute control signals without having to face a prescribed direction or look away from the patient. In addition, although specific protocols of the RF communication are not addressed, lacking any criticality, techniques such as handshaking and digital encoding would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art depending upon the particulars of the application.

Conclusion

- 4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Heinonen et al. provides the well-known teaching of a wireless communication device having an integrated display for communicating with medical equipment.
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shawna J. Shaw whose telephone number is (703) 308-2985. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 a.m. 5:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marvin Lateef can be reached on (703) 308-3256. The fax phone numbers

Page 5

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3590 for regular communications and (703) 308-0758 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

Shawna J. Shaw

Primary Examiner

May 29, 2003